REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 1-4 are now in the application. Claim 3 has been amended. New claim 4 has been added.

New claim 4 recites the feature of using additional information to assist in the reconstruction of the originally stored data. Support for this feature may be found on page 3, lines 11-16 and page 13, line 24 to page 14, line 2 of the instant specification.

In item 2 on page 2 of the above-identified Office action, claims 1-3 have been rejected as being anticipated by Iida (U.S. Patent 4,748,594) under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

As will be explained below, it is believed that the claims were patentable over the cited art in their original form and, therefore, the claims have not been amended to overcome the references.

Before discussing the prior art in detail, it is believed that a brief review of the invention as claimed, would be helpful.

Claim 1 calls for, *inter alia*, an operating method, which comprises the steps of:

storing the data in a memory device a plurality of times resulting in originally stored data; and

reconstructing the originally stored data as required from the data stored a plurality of times taking into account a direction of any memory content changes which arise.

The Iida reference discloses an integrated circuit device having a memory. A plurality of identical versions, that is, different sets, of a given piece of data are stored at different addresses in the memory 200. The information is read out on a time-division basis. When the three sets of information have been read out a logic operation is performed in the majority circuit so that an output is obtained according to the truth table shown in Table 1 (col. 5) of Iida. There is no disclosure or teaching of reconstructing the originally stored data taking into consideration a direction of any memory content change that may occur.

Clearly, Iida does not show "reconstructing the originally stored data as required from the data stored a plurality of times taking into account a direction of any memory content

changes which arise" as recited in claim 1 of the instant application.

Moreover, new dependent claim 4 recites "providing additional information dependent on the data being stored in the memory device; and reconstructing the originally stored data as required from the data stored a plurality of times and the additional information" which is not disclosed or suggested in Iida.

It is accordingly believed to be clear that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, either show or suggest the features of claim 1. Claim 1 is, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art. The dependent claims are believed to be patentable as well because they all are ultimately dependent on claim 1. Further, dependent claim 4 contains features that are not shown or suggested in the prior art.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-3 together with new claim 4 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel would appreciate receiving a

Page 6 of 7

Applic. No. 09/845,874
Amdt. Dated February 10, 2004
Reply to Office Action of December 4, 2003

telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can

be worked out.

If an extension of time for this paper is required, petition

for extension is herewith made.

Please charge any other fees that might be due with respect to

Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner and

Greenberg, P.A., No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,

For Applicants

LAURENCE A. GREENBERG
REG. NO. 29,300

FDP/bb

February 10, 2004

Lerner and Greenberg, P.A.
Post Office Box 2480
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480
Tel: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101